CHAPTER IV

Comparing Cohesion in the North Vietnamese, US, Soviet, and Israeli Armies

Physical, Security, and Social Requirements

The North Vietnamese Army

FOOD, WATER, AMMUNITION, MEDICINE, and similar logistical requirements presented major problems for the North Vietnamese Army.[1] Terrain, dense jungle, US interdiction, and an underdeveloped logistical support system severely strained North Vietnamese capabilities to provide North Vietnamese Army (NVA) soldiers necessary supplies. The impact on NVA cohesion was sometimes severe as a series of entries from a captured diary make clear:

> *24 August 1965*—I am leaving the camp tonight. My heart is filled with love for my homeland. I pledge to achieve victory before returning to my homeland.
>
> *4 September 1965*—We hold no hope of life. No words can express the hardships of our lives. I feel pessimistic and downhearted. Can anyone understand my inner feelings?
>
> *1 January 1966*—No vegetables and meat can be found here. We have nothing for food except salt, salted shrimp paste,

> and dried fish. How unbearable life is.
>
> *18 July 1966*—The horrible disease deprives me of sleep and appetite. I now envision so many horrid scenes. My heart is filled with bitterness. I wish I could leave the hospital, but the frightful paralysis keeps tormenting me. . . .
>
> *28 July 1966*—My sickness does not seem to improve. Who can understand me? What would they take me for?
>
> *29 July 1966*—[last entry] Time keeps going its steady course. Life remains unchanged.[2]

Compared with US soldiers, however, NVA soldiers had relatively low expectations concerning logistical support. Although individual soldiers defected because of inadequate support, strong unit cohesion was maintained, and there were no platoon-level or higher NVA unit defections.[3] A combination of very strong cohesion and of sometimes skimpy but overall adequate logistical support allowed the NVA to endure.

The military unit became the primary social group for the NVA soldier and as such replaced his family, friends, and all other relationships as the chief determinant of his behavior. The NVA soldier was bound by the expectations and needs of his fellow soldiers. In return, the unit provided the primary social affiliation and source of esteem, recognition, and comradely affection. Interviews with captured prisoners and captured documents show that, within the NVA, the three-man military cell became the group that controlled most NVA soldiers:

> The three-man cell is characterized by mutual aid between members which is based on . . . mutual affection among comrades . . . they take care of one another's moral and physical lives. . . .
>
> The three-man cell is suitable . . . for approaching members and finding out their thoughts through exchange of personal feelings . . . and for applying all the tactics of our army. Every combat and tactical initiative can be cleverly and skillfully applied through the three-man cell.[4]

NVA prisoners, like the private quoted below, also testified to the central significance of the three-man military cell:

> *Question:* Do you think the three-man cell system helps the men's fighting spirit?
>
> *Answer:* . . . in combat the cell-leader directly commanded the two other members of

> the cell. . . . By telling the two other men to carry out the attack, one on his right and the other on his left, the cell-leader was able to coordinate their actions and keep an eye on his cell.

Within the NVA, the individual soldier believed that he had influence over those events that he and his unit were most concerned with. Because his immediate leaders intervened where necessary to protect him from distant and impersonal contacts with higher headquarters and because they solicited his opinions and judgment, the NVA soldier usually became personally committed to unit objectives. Interviews with captured NVA troops make evident the joint nature of mission planning:

> *Question:* Were the fighters given a chance to discuss and criticize a plan of operation before the operation?
>
> *Answer:* Yes, they were given the chance to discuss and criticize. The idea was to get unity of command and action during the operation. Before any operation, a few among us would be sent out to make a study and survey of the battlefield, and then a plan of operation would be drawn up and presented to all the men in the unit. Each would then be given a chance to contribute ideas and suggestions. Each squad, each man, would be told what action to take if the enemy was to take such-and-such a position . . . but it was also the fighters' duty to contribute to the plan by advancing suggestions or criticizing what had been put forward. Thus, the final decision concerning an operation or attack was very often the result of a collective discussion in which each member had contributed his opinion or suggestion.[5]

What becomes clear from such interviews is that the NVA leader—who protected and provided for his men and listened to their concerns and ideas—significantly contributed to their combined sense of belonging to a unit capable of dealing with a surrounding hostile environment. The high priority given within the NVA to satisfying the soldier's physical, security, and social needs

resulted in the NVA soldier's identifying strongly with his immediate leaders and unit. An NVA small-unit leader (or cadre) made this point clear in a discussion of the sharing that went on between leader and men:

> As far as relations between the cadres and the fighters were concerned, I can also say that close ties existed between them. Take, for example, the case of some of the fighters becoming ill: often a cadre would take care of the sick fighters. There were also cases of cadres sharing their food and clothing rations with the fighter. I can tell you that we cadres shared everything with our fighters, be it a small item, such as a bite of food or a bigger thing, such as money. Very often, with our own money, we went to buy odd things that we shared with the fighters, and vice versa. If the fighters had the money, it was their turn to spend and share it with us. There was no case of each one keeping his own possession to himself alone, or hiding it away from others. The friendship and unity that existed among the cadres and fighters were as close as among the cadres themselves.

An NVA soldier also spoke of the closeness between cadre and men:

Question: Describe the cadres in your unit. What kind of persons were they?

Answer: We all respected and obeyed our leaders because, as I told you, they were nice people. . . . They always lived with us, ate with us, and they understood us very well. We strictly obeyed any order received from them. . . .

Question: Do you think the cadre knew everything that was going on in the unit?

Answer: He lived with, and ate with us. Sometimes, when we talked to each other, he came and talked to us too. I think he knew everything.[6]

The United States Army

Logistical support in providing the US soldier food, water, ammunition, and medical support has never been a systemic problem to the extent that failure to provide adequate support threatened unit cohesion. The US Army has probably been the best fed

and supplied army in recent history. This record might, however, become a liability. The failure to maintain the level of expected support in a future conflict might cause the soldier to think that the support system was unraveling, and unit cohesion could be adversely affected. The US commander whose troops have been forced to miss even one meal because of the uncertainties of field operations realizes how quickly the perception that there has been a "major failure" can spread through a unit. This is in sharp contrast with other armies, where expectations about resupply are low, resupply is not routine, and cohesion is not affected easily.

The greatest failure in providing for the soldier's needs in US units is the failure to meet the security and social needs necessary for building cohesive units. With the exception perhaps of some ranger and airborne units, the US soldier does not typically affiliate with his unit as the dominant primary group in his life. He generally meets his security and social needs beyond the boundaries of the US Army. The small unit has not replaced other primary influences such as family, friends, and other groups as the primary determinant of his day-to-day behavior. Consequently, the US soldier is usually not bound by the expectations and needs of his fellows as is the case in strongly cohesive units. Other claims from beyond the unit overshadow his obligations to his unit. In such a situation, the esteem, recognition, mutual affection, and sense of personal security required by the soldier are not provided by his unit. In units where these needs are not met, the soldier seeks them elsewhere, often in groups with behavior patterns and purposes that are not congruent with US Army goals. For example, this has resulted in drug and alcohol abuse as well as racial splintering.

The ability of the company, platoon, and squad to provide these basic needs for the soldier has been severely limited by the structure of the All-Volunteer Army. Charles C. Moskos notes:

> A hallmark of the traditional military has been the adjacency of work and living quarters. As late as the mid-1960s, it was practically unheard of for a bachelor enlisted man to live off base. Not only was it against regulations, but few could afford a private rental on junior enlisted pay. By 1981 . . . about one in four single enlisted members in stateside bases had apartments away from the military installation.[7]

In many units, well over half of the single junior enlisted men had off-post quarters where they routinely spent nights and off-duty time. Often these quarters became "crash pads" and centers for activities not permitted on post and hence attracted other soldiers who normally resided in the barracks.[8] Combined with the recent increase in marriages among junior enlisted men, especially E-4s of whom about 45 percent are married, it is apparent that for the majority, soldiering has become an 8-to-5 occupation.[9] Moskos makes the point:

> One of the outcomes of the large salary raises for junior enlisted personnel needed to recruit an all-volunteer military has been the ebbing of barracks life. . . . To the increasing proportion of single enlisted members living off base, one must add the growing number of junior enlisted people, nearly all of whom live on the civilian economy. Like civilian employees, many junior enlisted members are now part of the early morning and late afternoon exodus to and from work.[10]

Because of the limited time soldiers now spend in the unit area, the opportunities for leaders to become a primary influence in the soldier's life has been significantly limited. Because contact between soldiers, sergeants, and junior officers has been significantly curtailed, the soldier's strong identity with his immediate leaders has been attenuated. The sergeant is seen as less a leader and more an occupational supervisor with limited responsibilities and contact with the soldiers under his command.

The Soviet Army

Current logistical support of all types within the Soviet ground forces appears to be more than adequate to meet requirements for unit cohesion. The poor reputation of Soviet Army food has been the target of an extensive program in recent years to upgrade both quality and quantity of food. The Soviet soldier's daily ration is now 4,112 calories, so hunger is not a problem. Goldhower indicates, however, that the quality of food and surroundings still is:

> Despite improvements, many messes are poorly equipped and have old, wood-burning stoves. Hygienic conditions are poor, dishes are often not washed, and the food is *monotonous* and not attractively prepared. . . . The new five year plan . . .

> calls for new dining halls, cafes, and tea rooms in military garrisons.[11]

The conditions described above could affect cohesion in some armies, but the historically low expectation of Soviet soldiers and the improving trend in this area do not make the quality of logistical support a serious obstacle to the building of cohesive units in the Soviet Army.

Viktor Suvorov illustrates the Soviet attitude toward logistics:

> The Soviet Army has a completely different approach to the problems of supply from that adopted in the West—one which avoids many headaches. Let us start from the fact a Soviet soldier is not issued with a sleeping bag, and does not need one. He can be left unfed for several days. All that he needs is ammunition and this solves many problems.
>
> The problem of supplying Soviet troops in battle is thus confined to the provision of ammunition . . . every regiment has a company which can transport loads of 200 tons, every division a battalion with a capacity of 1,000 tons, every Army a transport regiment, and so forth. All this capacity is used solely to move up ammunition for advancing forces. Each commander allocates a large proportion of this ammunition to the sector which is achieving success—the remainder suffer accordingly.[12]

Basic Soviet assumptions about the nature of a future war in Europe, however, could significantly weaken the cohesiveness of Soviet ground forces for logistical reasons. Soviet expectations that war with NATO would be a short, intense war has caused them to structure their forces with one of the highest "teeth-to-tail" ratios evident in the world.[13] The Soviet Army is organized around a combat-to-support ratio of approximately 71-to-29, compared to an almost reverse ratio for the US Army. Should a protracted war develop, intense pressures on the cohesion of Soviet units would probably develop as logistical support became unavailable.

Within the Soviet Army the primary social group that the soldier affiliates with and that controls his day-to-day behavior is almost always found within the soldier's immediate unit. The reason is that, for his two-year enlistment, the typical Soviet soldier spends almost 24 hours a day, 365 days a year with his fellow

soldiers. Leave and other absences away from units are rare and carefully controlled. As a result, strongly cohesive groups or *Kollectives* appear to form within Soviet units. In most cases, the norms of these groups are congruent with Soviet Army objectives. But, in a significant number of cases, groups with sometimes deviant norms appear. The formation of deviant groups appears to follow a pattern within the Soviet Army that reflects the manifestation of broad cultural and ethnic problems readily evident within Soviet society.

The most serious cases of deviance can be attributed to ethnic conflict within specific types of units, conflict due to Soviet Army assignment policies. Units most likely to have problems are those purposely assigned a high number of non-Slavic soldiers. General assignment policies for minorities favor the elite units. The rocket troops (strategic and air defense) and the airborne get very few non-Slavs. In the basic combat arms, the tank and motor rifle units, the tanker units receive priority. Those motor rifle units that don't have "Guards" designations are lowest in priority, get the more "unreliable" non-Slavs, and tend to be stationed in the less important areas of the Soviet Union.[14] Rochells and Patton document these policies:

> Duty in combat units is practically reserved for the "reliable" Slavic nationalities which comprise approximately 80 percent of the Soviet combat forces . . . the few ethnic minorities who serve in combat units are for the most part relegated to support duties. On the other hand, the "unreliable" non-Slavs are the predominant group who serve in the combat support functions. For example, non-Slavs, particularly Central Asians, comprise up to 90 percent of the construction troops . . . they are considered second-class soldiers, receive little or no military training, and are most often armed with only a pick and shovel for their daily labors.[15]

Because the core Russian nationality is only 50 percent of the total Soviet population, the total Slav population together with the Ukrainians and others adds up to only about 60 percent of the total. Because of a growing non-Slav birth rate, the Soviets in 1967 decided to use the military as a cultural melting pot to Russify the non-Slavs.[16] For some purposes, it appears the Soviets have created two different armies. In other words, the Soviets have decided to accept ethnic conflict in certain elements of their Army so

long as they are able to maintain control, further the Russification of Soviet society, and avoid the dangers of creating "national" units of all one ethnic type.[17] In the rest of the Army, the more elite combat units, comprised of more reliable Slavs, the Soviets appear to have achieved a remarkable degree of military cohesion. The main point is that for the critical units there is little or no ethnic conflict; their cohesion and control by the Soviet Army appears to be firm. Recent and widely publicized accounts of violent ethnic conflict, theft of food, ineffectiveness, and chaos bordering on disintegration should be assessed with the above in mind.[18] Two very well-known and respected observers of the Soviet Army recently noted, in response to similar reports, that widespread evidence of conflict does not appear to be available: "of the hundreds of thousands of soldiers we've seen, none looked like they were starving or had been beaten."[19]

Drunkenness and boredom do appear to be problems in most Soviet Army units, but effects on cohesion, if any, are not clear. There is some evidence to suggest that the socialization process in Soviet society reduces the effects of boredom and drinking, which in any event are more tightly controlled within the Army. A former Soviet soldier and knowledgeable analyst of the Soviet Army states:

> It is commonly perceived in the West that the Soviet Army has an alcoholism problem equivalent to drug problems in Western armies. This is not true. . . .
>
> The army has a built-in advantage for its anti-drinking program: Soviet draftees are eighteen and nineteen years old, thus belonging to a population group with a relatively low percentage of heavy drinkers. . . .
>
> Soviet Army regulations completely forbid any use of alcohol by draftees at any time, anywhere. . . . Penalties absolutely disproportionate to the deed are meted out if there is any proof at all of consumption like the smelling [of] alcohol on the breath. They might range from washing the floors to ten days of confinement in a guard-house. . . . But no punishment, however severe, will ever prevent healthy soldiers from getting an occasional bottle, and their resourcefulness is truly limitless in this undertaking.
>
> The geographical location of most of the military units is always at a considerable distance from towns and stores.

> Garrisons have fences around them and check-points whose primary purpose is to see that alcohol is not smuggled in. Cars and soldiers are searched and bottles are broken right away. The distance from the stores and tight control over the soldier's time make the procurement of alcohol more difficult.
>
> Finally, the average soldiers have very little money to spend on alcohol. This is the largest deterrent. A soldier's three roubles eighty copecks monthly salary must cover all his expenses. . . . Although the illicit sale of military property takes place all the time it is neither easy to do nor a mass phenomenon. A soldier with the means to purchase a bottle will always share it with several friends, making it unlikely that any will manage to get drunk.
>
> Although the Soviet Army fails in its endeavors to enforce a strict dry law, there is no doubt that the American Army consumes much more alcohol. The American soldier is allowed to buy and drink enormous amounts of alcohol which his Soviet counterpart has neither the money nor the opportunity to get. If there is a drinking problem among Soviet soldiers, it is that they defy the total ban of alcohol consumption. However, drinking is not a health hazard or a danger to overall military performance of the Soviet Army, nor does it affect a large percentage of draftees.[20]

Pressure in the Soviet Army is intense. The recent decision to assist the Soviet economy by increasing civilian manpower through reducing Army enlistments from three to two years has made time very precious in all units. At any one time, approximately 25 percent of a unit's soldiers are new recruits who must be trained and integrated. In addition, high combat readiness goals are pursued. As a result, long hours and seven-day weeks are the rule with little free time. Boredom and drinking result, but the loyalties of the Russian soldier do not seem to waiver.

It appears that there is less need for the Soviet soldier to be protected from authoritarian "higher-ups" than soldiers from other societies that have a tradition of democratic participation. In commenting on the nature of Soviet society and how it complements life in the Soviet Army, Erickson observes:

> A citizen of the USSR today accepts autocratic interest, interference, and direction in all spheres of life. . . . The Russian people have accepted, and still accept, dictatorship without too much complaint because it has been an effective form of

> government in dealing with those problems which the people themselves have considered important.[21]

Though pressures within the Soviet Army toward disintegration (ethnic conflict, boredom, drinking) have been emphasized in the Western press, they have been, to a significant degree, taken out of the special context of Soviet history and development. Above all, such events cannot be judged primarily by Western standards. Within their own peculiar organization, which accommodates these problems to some degree, strong cohesion does exist among the various nationalities in Soviet units. And some progress toward overall unity is being made. In regard to a particular nationality, one former Soviet soldier stated that he had

> rarely seen such a deep devotion to one another. They try as a national group to be together at all times. They were very good in the military service, absolutely impeccable soldiers, and very disciplined.[22]

Another soldier noted that over time the various ethnic groups became closer:

> After the first term of service, the relationship among nationalities becomes more equal; all become more like brothers. During the first term of service, Uzbeks make friends only with Uzbeks, Russians with Russians, Jews with Jews, and so forth. But in subsequent service, this is levelled out.[23]

The Israeli Army

Because of very short internal lines of communication and supply during the several wars Israel has had with its Arab neighbors, logistical resupply has been greatly simplified for the Israeli Army (IDF).[24] Great willingness on the part of the Israeli soldier to make do with the minimum and give priority to fuel, water, and ammunition while pressing the offense also eased requirements for meeting the physical needs of the Israeli soldier. As a result, cohesion in the Israeli Army has not been significantly weakened by inability to provide high levels of logistical support.

The Israeli Army is made up of three parts: a professional *nucleus* of some officers and noncommissioned officers (NCOs), those serving their two-to-three-year obligation, and the reserves. All elements show an extremely strong attachment to their units,

which become, for most, the primary influence in their day-to-day behavior for those on active duty. Even in the reserves, the attraction of the active army remains strong, with reserve members often saying that they are on an 11-month leave from the army. The following quote illustrates the influence the unit retains over its soldiers:

> It is remarkable how many soldiers, boys and girls who have completed their term of service, keep returning to the unit for a chat with the commander, or to see "what's new" with the buddies they left behind.[25]

Other observers report the same. The Israeli soldier's unit becomes his primary social affiliation and promotes a very strong sense of mutual affection and attraction among unit members. The unit also becomes a major source of esteem and recognition for the young Israeli soldier, usually still in his teens. As Samuel Rolbant indicates, the influence of the unit in breaking the strong hold of family and community is great:

> Then at the age of seventeen and a half he leaves home and family to spend two and a half years in the Army. . . . A new process of social integration and development is set in motion, influencing his behavior, attitudes, and tastes. When he comes home on leave his family sadly observe that he has changed. He is intolerant of the old ways, critical of meaningless particularism, and looks upon his immediate environment as a suffocating focus of outmoded tradition. He is soon at loggerheads with his elders and is impatient to get back to camp.[26]

The Israeli soldier also has a very strong sense of participation in the events his unit is engaged in, a sense of being able to influence events that affect him and his unit. Rolbant observes:

> Traditionally the average Israeli soldier likes to know what he is doing, and is an unquenchable arguer. He rarely lets anything pass without commenting on it, invariably getting himself involved in a heated argument with his pals about the rights and wrongs of the situation.[27]

The Israeli Army reacts to the complaints and reports of soldiers at all levels and provides the soldier with a sense of influence over events in his life:

> Every recruit regards it his inalienable right to lodge a complaint which, by Israeli usage, can reach the Chief of Staff. It

> is not uncommon for the head of the Army to interrupt discussions at a meeting of the General Staff to inquire what happened to Private Abutbul's complaint, or if anything had been done with it. Heads of corps and front commanders alike seem to be as sensitive to soldiers' grievances as they are about the performance of their formations.[28]

Because the Israeli Army does not have a large standing professional NCO corps, the soldier's immediate superior is likely to be of the same generation, or at most two or three years older. He is chosen because of his superior abilities and aptitudes during basic training. Because the Army has so much legitimacy with Israeli soldiers, they identify strongly with their immediate leaders, who have proven themselves to be the most outstanding soldiers and deserving positions of responsibility and leadership.

TABLE 1

Unit Ability to Provide for Soldier's Physical, Security and Social Affiliation Needs

Element	*Army*			
	North Vietnamese	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Unit meets basic logistical requirements	+	+ +	+	+ +
Unit is primary social group	+ +	--	+ +	+ +
Unit is major source of esteem and recogition	+ +	-	+ +	+ +
Unit protects soldier from higher headquarters	+ +	+	-	+
Unit provides sense of control over events	+ +	+	-	+ +
Unit causes soldier to identify with leaders and Army goals	+ +	-	-	+ +

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --

The Soldier's Perception of Successfully Escaping the Army

The North Vietnamese Army

There was little doubt in the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) soldier's mind that he could not successfully escape from his unit. Even if he could divorce himself from his comrades and the overwhelming compulsion of the group, the constant surveillance by his unit leadership and fellow soldiers made a successful departure unlikely. During normal operations, group cohesion was enough to keep the NVA soldier with his unit. During the few extended periods of unmitigated hardship and dangers, when the effects of cohesion were lessened, the surveillance and constant presence of NVA leaders made departure impossible. Small-unit leaders within the NVA knew their soldiers so well that those who were most susceptible to the pressures of hardship and danger were given extra attention. In discussion, a small-unit leader (cadre) indicated how well leaders knew their men:

> . . . the fighters were watched very closely from the lowest squad level up. Therefore, we had all the information about their behaviour and performance from one day to another. By watching them directly and indirectly, that is to say, by following up the reports made on them, we cadres knew whether a man had really good morale or not. Even if a man pretended or hid something, he would eventually be found out, no matter how well he pretended or how carefully he hid. Take, for example, the case of a fighter having an affair with a female: in such case, he'd of course try to conceal it from other people as much as possible, but finally he'd be found out. The same thing can be said of any weakness—how can it possibly be hidden all the time?

An NVA private who had deserted also testified to the effectiveness of the cadre:

Question: Who was in charge . . . of morale problems in your unit?

Answer: My unit had an excellent political cadre. He was very skillful in convincing people, particularly those who worried about their families. He used to get in contact with the soldiers in private to advise and

comfort them. Everyone liked him and followed his advice. Unfortunately he was transferred to another place, leaving the post vacant for two months. If he had remained longer in my unit, I would have been unable to leave. . . .

Question: Did the political cadre in your unit do his work well?

Answer: They strengthened discipline and prevented desertion. Only during his absence from the unit did many desertions occur, mine included. I think if he left the unit for five or six months without a good replacement, most of the people would desert . . . his behavior, attitudes and performance always remained the same. He never lost the heart of any soldier.[29]

In addition to the attraction of the group and surveillance by unit leaders, strong moral and physical barriers clouded any thoughts of desertion. The unit ties were reinforced by anxieties caused by ambiguous, dangerous, and often alien conditions beyond unit boundaries. It was NVA policy to assign main force soldiers some distance from their home villages and if possible to separate them from village and boyhood friends, all in order to increase their dependence upon their units.[30]

Transfer and discharges within the NVA were extremely rare. The unspoken policy was that NVA soldiers were assigned for the duration of the conflict. Rewards and recognition for successful service were not expected until the war was over. The NVA soldier who could not wait and who considered AWOL and desertion had also to consider the personal punishment he would suffer if he were caught as well as the significant social and economic sanctions his family and parents would suffer at the hands of the Viet Cong.

The United States Army

Within the All-Volunteer Army, opportunities to leave voluntarily or to be "fired" are plentiful; they reinforce the soldier's perception that he has a job or an occupation, rather than a responsibility to serve the nation as a soldier.[31] The US

soldier does not perceive significant legal, moral, or physical barriers that separate him from the remainder of society and that tend to keep him within his unit. Certainly cohesion is not reinforced by an organizational reluctance to grant discharges and transfers easily, and "bad paper" discharges carry little social sanction. AWOL and desertion are no longer considered major breeches of trust with the unit and with society, because of the ease with which soldiers can now quit.

> Since the end of the draft, however, about one in three service members were failing to complete initial enlistments. From 1973 through 1981, over 800,000 young people have been prematurely discharged from the military . . . the AVF, like industrial organizations, is witnessing the common occurrence of its members "quitting" or being "fired." In time, it is possible that a general certificate of separation will replace the present discharge classification system . . . there would no longer be a stigma for unsuccessful service. Such a development would make the military that much more consistent with the civilian work model. In all but name, the AVF has already gone a long way down the road toward indeterminant enlistments.[32]

The termination of the GI Bill and other benefits has also weakened cohesion by removing highly visible rewards that once signaled American society's respect for those who served in the Armed Forces. The more a nation emphasizes and rewards sacrifice and honorable service, the greater the attraction of military service and the stronger the binding of a soldier to his unit. The US Army has apparently lost this source of cohesion.

The Soviet Army

The Soviet soldier does not view his chances of successfully leaving his unit to be significant. A number of factors ensure that the great majority of Soviet soldiers who enter active duty will complete their two years of service. There is, for example, widespread support throughout Soviet society for military service. The Soviet Armed Forces, especially since "The Great Patriotic War" (World War II), have been credited with saving the "Motherland," and significant public support for a strong defense continues. Soviet Army assignment policies reinforce this attitude by

consciously erecting physical barriers to isolate a soldier from the local population, thus providing him fewer opportunities to leave his unit. A Soviet soldier describes this policy:

> A great deal of translocation is going on all the time. For example, Russians would be sent to serve in Kazakhastan, Kazakhs would go to the Ukraine. Ukrainians could serve in Georgia, Georgians somewhere in the Baltic area, and the Baltic people might end up in Russia. . . . The government is trying all the time to make sure that military personnel will have no ties to the local population.[33]

Once a soldier is assigned to a unit, great efforts are made to indoctrinate him to become a good Communist soldier. Part of this indoctrination involves long hours studying rules and regulations that clearly set forth his responsibilities and that significantly bind the soldier to his unit. Goldhamer makes the point:

> Soviet military authorities believe that a continuous study of the regulations helps to produce conformity to them. . . . Indeed, continuous study of the regulations is recommended by a Soviet Army saying: Old soldier, the service is your board and keep, read the regulations instead of going to sleep.[34]

Upon assignment, the soldier can expect to complete his two years with his unit far away from his home region. Discharges and transfers are rare exceptions. For those soldiers (especially the 18- and 19-year olds) who attempt desertion or AWOL, punishment is swift and severe. A Soviet soldier described the severity of Soviet action:

> Two Central Asian soldiers beat regular soldiers to get their Kalashnikov (AK 47) machine guns, discs, and cartridges, and off they went. . . . Finally, they were caught, and there was an exchange of fire, and they were killed. . . . Special troops were raised to hunt them down; the forests were combed.[35]

Troops who desert appear to be the exception; most did their duty. Reflecting on soldiers of peasant background stationed in East Europe, a Russian soldier notes:

> [They were] very much attached to their villages and families, and would rarely think of running away. Also they are not Western oriented. Indeed, they are afraid of the West because it is something they don't know. For them, Russia and their relatives back in the Motherland are everything.

Cohesion is further promoted by rewarding Soviet soldiers with higher priorities for the good things in Soviet society upon completion of their service and return to civilian life. They are given preference in obtaining housing and jobs. Additionally, for those who qualify for advanced schooling, limits and quotas are not applied against them.

Overall, then, the Soviets have assembled a set of procedures, rules, and circumstances that closely bind the soldier to his unit and help form the necessary conditions for building strong, cohesive units.

The Israeli Army

The Israeli soldier is acutely aware of the moral boundaries that separate him from and prevent him from returning to civilian life until his responsibilities have been completed. The strength of the moral obligation felt by the Israeli soldier strongly outweighs any thoughts of leaving the hardship and danger facing his unit. In interviews, Israeli soldiers spoke of this obligation:

> The vague fear of shame, of possible ostracism or disapproval they might experience on getting home alive unscratched, featured prominently in the boys' answers about their behavior on the battlefield. Everybody knew where you were, in what outfit you served, what you did or failed to do, so that it was imperative to return with a clean bill of moral health, morality in this case being judged by standards of selflessness.[36]

Under the Israeli Defense Service law, exemptions from service and early discharges are the rare exceptions. About 90 percent of the Jewish males who reach service age each year are drafted.[37] Of those who are exempted, the majority are attending long-term, religious training. Others have severe medical, criminal, or suitability problems. Of the 90 percent who are drafted, all but about 6 percent complete their term of service. Of that small number, most come from a semi-annual special draft that accepts young men with lower standards or criminal records. Such recruits are given special training prior to assignment in an attempt to steer them from a life of "vagrancy and crime." [38] For those few Israeli soldiers who do leave their units without authorization, significant legal and social sanctions are applied. These statistics are significant when compared, for example, with similar US

figures. First, approximately 50 percent of US males are determined to be "unfit." Of those accepted into the All-Volunteer Army, approximately one-third leave before their term of service is complete without significant penalty.

Special programs designed to reward faithful completion of service are not emphasized by the Israeli Army. The common understanding among all concerned is that such service is the norm. To do less not only violates small-unit expectations but also seriously disregards central Israeli values and obligations of citizenship.

TABLE 2

Soldier's Perceptions of Successfully Escaping the Unit

	Army			
Element	*North Vietnamese*	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Legal, moral, physical barriers separating him from society	+ +	--	+ +	+ +
Difficulty in obtaining discharge or transfer	+ +	-	+ +	+ +
Significance of "bad paper" discharge	+ +	-	+ +	+ +
Penalties for AWOL/desertion	+ +	-	+ +	+ +
Recognition/rewards for tour completion	+	+	+ +	+

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --

Maintenance of Unit Integrity and Stability

The North Vietnamese Army

The NVA instituted a set of policies and procedures that ensured that the unit dominated the soldier's life 24 hours a day. The NVA relied upon the three-man military cell to allow the formal

organization to reach to every individual soldier and control his behavior during off-duty maintenance hours as well as during operations and training.[39]

Once assigned to a three-man cell within a squad and platoon, the individual soldier could count on remaining with his comrades as part of that small unit. As a matter of policy, the NVA did not use an individual replacement system but recognized that unit rotation was essential for maintaining group cohesion.[40]

A cadre notes the significance of the three-man military cell and of NVA policies designed to keep lower level units together once formed:

> Thanks to the three-man cells, we were able to keep track of the men's morale. . . . It was hard to tell whose morale was the highest when we were at camp, but during combat, whoever was fearless was the one who had good morale. As we fought by the three-man cells, it was easy to check the men's morale. After each battle, the cell leader reported the morale of the men in the cell to the squad leaders who reported to the platoon leaders and so on. As company leader, I got a pretty good picture of the men's fighting spirit.

A private's perception of the usefulness of the three-man cell was somewhat different, but he also recognized its utility:

> In my opinion, that three-man cell system is somewhat useful. When I was lonely in the forest, I could confide to my cell members about my native place, my village. In assignments, men in the same cell could work together, help and follow up one another. In fighting, they fought side by side and covered one another. That system tied three men together, so as to limit free movement and made desertion difficult. The interdependence in a cell was also good for the command of the unit. Since the men in a cell moved together in combat, they might report the efficiencies and deficiencies of their comrades to the squad leader.[41]

Intense, lengthy, and frequent association among unit members characterized day-to-day life in the NVA. Throughout the time soldiers were part of an NVA unit, leaders carried out intense socialization and resocialization programs. The NVA soldier quickly assumed attitudes and behavior congruent with those desired by his leaders and the organization. Through intense group pressures manipulated by unit leaders, the soldier accepted group

norms that were firmly grounded in the dominant bonds and expectations formed between him and his fellow soldiers.

In addition to operations, training, and billeting, day-to-day housekeeping chores, ceremonies, and recreational activities were all designed to maintain group cohesion. Passes and leaves were very infrequent and allowed only to those soldiers who had consistently displayed attitudes of solidarity with the group. Association with individuals or autonomous groups beyond the unit was not permitted. In effect, the unit and the three-man military cell became the source of the material good things in the NVA soldier's life as well as the source and enforcer of social rules for the soldier.[42] The importance of NVA policies on unit integrity and stabiliy for the maintenance of cohesion in NVA squads and platoons is clearly reflected in an interview with an NVA soldier:

Question: What do you think of the three-man-cell system? Did that system raise the morale and the fighting spirit of the VC troops?

Answer: . . . during fighting, everybody had the duty to take care of his wounded cell members or move his dead cell member out of the battlefield. During a mission, people in a cell should stay close together and help one another in their joint duty. The three-man-cell system helped the squad leader or platoon leader to have close control of his troops who operated separately. For instance, during a mission in the plain, if a man stole something from the people he would be criticized by his cell members (even) before they brought it up in a squad meeting. The cells usually met every evening to review the daily activities.[43]

The United States Army

The deeper one goes into the structure of the US Army, the greater the personnel turbulence seems to become. At brigade and battalion levels, with the current emphasis on extended command tours, greater stability is evident. At platoon and squad level, however, the personnel situation remains extremely turbulent. At fire-team or crew level—the basic three-to-five-man organizations

that should be the bedrock of stability for the soldier and for cohesion—extreme personnel fluidity persists. A recent assessment noted problems in some divisions:

> There is a 16-percent turnover every three months with a battalion turning over completely in 1½ years and this does not include internal reassignments within battalions. The cause is described as excessive overseas personnel demands, but the basic cause is rooted in the philosophy upon which the Army's personnel system is based. Central is the pre-eminence of the individual in all personnel programs from recruitment through training assignment and quartering. . . . The requirement to maintain forces worldwide caused us to manage soldiers as "spare parts" represented by an MOS [military occupational specialty], with little thought about the impact of frequent moves on unit cohesion.[44]

Recent Army initiatives promise to address the problem, especially with programs designed to bring personnel stability into the ranks, permit unit rotation, and allow cohesion to grow. These programs, however, are not yet fully implemented. Significant turbulence remains. Proposed unit rotation plans at company and battalion levels would assist in the creation of cohesive units. Significantly, however, even if turbulence is reduced, such programs will do nothing to address the failure of current policies designed to cause the soldier to associate within his unit and identify with his immediate leaders. The problems of horizontal and vertical bonding or achieving military cohesion will persist as long as these policies exist.

Much of the proposed program is probably focused at too high an organizational level—at the brigade and battalion levels. A regimental system is not a necessary prerequisite for building cohesive units, and extended command tours at battalion and brigade levels, although helpful, are not the panacea envisioned. Cohesion occurs primarily at the squad, platoon, and company levels, and examples of cohesion without a regimental system are plentiful. US Army efforts to create cohesive units are focused at the brigade and battalion levels, possibly because most of the action officers working on the problem are colonels or lieutenant colonels and tend to project organizational solutions at their experience and rank levels.

To some degree, basic training in the US Army has become a rite of passage that succeeds in resocializing trainees and forming strong pro-military norms and cohesive units. Pro-Army attitudes and the cohesion established in basic training tend to be dissipated, however, by assignment of soldiers as individuals by MOS, rather than as part of a unit, as proposed under the cohort program. Cost-effectiveness analysis has also worked against cohesion. Analysts tend to eliminate portions of training programs and practices (such as parades and unit days) that promote cohesion but don't contribute to learning a skill; they are seen as areas in which time and money can be saved.

The maintenance of high frequency of association and structured relationships necessary within units for the promotion of cohesion is very weak in the US Army. A large portion of the fault lies with the personnel turbulence described earlier. Other practices, however, also make a major contribution to this failure. Small-unit boundaries should be reinforced through design of barracks, mess halls, day rooms, service clubs, and athletic facilities; unfortunately, they are not. Instead, cost-effectiveness considerations in building consolidated mess halls and other facilities and Army attempts to attract recruits through motel-like barracks rather than squad and platoon bays are prime examples of policies that have significantly reduced the frequency of association among members of a unit that is necessary for cohesion.

Practices that structure relationships within small units and add to the key nature of junior leaders have been weakened through two developments. First, junior sergeants are often not available and, when assigned, are often not able to gain the necessary control because of inadequate leadership skills and lack of authority (see chapter 8). The problems of one platoon, recently discussed in *Army*, make the point:

> A platoon recently visited had been organized under the cohesive unit program. . . . What immediately became apparent was that the desire and willingness were present in this platoon but the know-how was not. The cadre consisted of an E6 with acting squad leaders and team leaders selected from among the platoon members. They had recently arrived on post and were obviously waiting for the leadership and challenge they had experienced in basic training. They did not yet realize that these were to be provided from within the

> platoon. Frustration and disillusionment were only a matter of time for that platoon.[45]

Unfortunately, this situation is being corrected by promoting sergeants who are not yet fully qualified. As a senior Army official observed, the result is that "We will have NCOs who are not nearly as bright as the people they're supposed to be leading" (*Washington Post*, 15 May 1983, p. A2).

A second practice that weakens the ties between small-unit leaders and their soldiers is the increasing tendency toward bureaucratic, centralized control over the "good" things in the soldier's life. Control of such items as pay, promotions, leave, passes, and awards, while subject to uniform policies, should be perceived by the soldier as being under the direct control of his immediate leaders. The centralization of these procedures and the diminution of the junior leader's role in their execution detracts significantly from the ability of unit leaders to use these rewards in building unit cohesion.

Similarly, unit boundaries are not distinct. Ceremonies and distinctive unit traditions have been de-emphasized under the press of training requirements and the general trend toward an "occupational" view of the soldier's task. Very liberal leave policies and the almost complete abandonment of restrictive pass policies have contributed significantly to the deterioration of unit boundaries. With the advent of the All-Volunteer Army and the abolishment of then-existing pass policies, the squad leader and platoon sergeant lost the ability to control their soldiers 24 hours a day. In effect, unit leaders have become shift bosses in the soldier's daily existence. Most soldiers are independent of their units and of their immediate leader's influence for two-thirds of the day on a routine basis; such independence makes the task of building cohesive units enormously difficult. The great amount of free time away from the unit also permits the soldier increased opportunities to associate with autonomous groups with possibly deviant norms. Sergeants, as well as junior enlisted men and some officers, are using this free time for moon-lighting, a further indication that the unit is just a part-time association with increasingly indistinct boundaries.

The Soviet Army

Stability and the maintenance of unit integrity in the Soviet Army are based on firm policies that significantly promote cohesion. Once assigned to his unit, the Soviet soldier typically remains in that unit—not only in the same regiment and battalion, but in the same company, platoon, and squad for his two-year enlistment. Leadership at these levels is so stable that the Soviet soldier is familiar with most of his leaders. Should it be necessary, units are rotated among missions, rather than rotate individual soldiers.

From the moment he enters the Soviet Army, the new soldier becomes exposed to an intense socialization process that builds upon many of the pro-military values he has acquired in civilian life. In many respects, this process can be viewed as a rite of passage. The official Soviet view, as Erickson and Feuchtwanger describe it, is that there are distinct phases of the soldier's two-year enlistment:

> the first six-month period, when he is gauche and disoriented, and overawed by the difficulties of military life and the strict discipline; the middle twelve months, when he has learned to live with the system and extracts a great deal of satisfaction from team activities and mastering his military skills; and his final six-month period when his . . . main concern is his rapidly approaching demobilization.[46]

During the passage of this two-year period, certain rituals mark his resocialization into the strong and dominant system of norms governing his unit, his fellow soldiers, and himself. The first of these, as Goldhamer points out, occurs immediately upon arrival:

> When the young inductee arrives at his regiment, a traditional billeting ceremony takes place in the barracks. Sometimes the new soldier is placed next to the cot of a second-year soldier, often one from his own geographical area. He will thus be able to learn from his senior comrade.[47]

An informal passage—in many respects similar to the hazing of new members in other armies and organizations—also takes place at this time for new soldiers who arrive at their new unit in a group. Although such treatment appears to be unpleasant in many respects, it usually succeeds in rapidly building a strong

cohesiveness among the newcomers. The nature of this "passage" concerns Soviet authorities when it becomes excessively rough and exploits the new recruit by having him perform duties of older soldiers.[48] Within six months, however, the exploited become the exploiters, forcing a new group through the process.

A very important ritual is held for the new soldier only after he has been in the unit long enough for the political officer to ensure that he understands the significance of the "military oath." The new recruit then very formally takes the oath alone before all members of the unit and the unit flag at an historical site of combat glory if possible:

> As each recruit's name is read out by the commander, the soldier leaves the ranks and reads the text of the oath aloud before his formation, after which he signs a special roster and returns to the ranks. After the oath has been taken, the band plays the national anthem and the unit passes in review. The day on which the oath is taken is a holiday for that unit.[49]

Many units distinguish their uniqueness and create unit identity through a ceremony that has "great emotional influence on the man, and engenders in him . . . the aspiration to endure the difficulties of life steadfastly." [50] Such a tradition in one unit Goldhamer describes movingly:

> The lieutenant who assigns the guards to duty first reads the assignment for a soldier who in fact is dead and who died as a 'hero'; the guard who stands first in line answers 'present' on behalf of the fallen man. In the barracks a bunk is still made up for him, with a photograph of the dead man above it.[51]

The facilities in which the Soviet soldier spends most of his time on and off duty ensure a remarkably high degree of association among members of the same unit. Soviet barracks, mess halls, "tea rooms," and other facilities thus significantly promote cohesion.

Leave and passes are difficult to obtain for the two-year soldier and are often associated with incentives to perform well as a soldier. Significant numbers of soldiers have reported that they were allowed away from their units less than ten times during the entire time they were in the Army. Over half the soldiers in one group interviewed stated that during their service they "rarely" or "almost never got away to 'meet women.' " [52] Often when passes

were granted it was in groups of two or more under the control of a sergeant.

During his two-year tour, the Soviet soldier is thus bound to his unit so closely that he has few if any opportunities to join autonomous groups beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Army. This does not mean, however, that the Soviet soldier is beyond the reach of groups within the Army with possibly deviant norms that can work against unit cohesion. This, in fact, does occur in those units that experience significant ethnic conflict, especially when unit leaders consciously pursue discriminatory policies in violation of Soviet Army policy. Wimbush and Alexiev report one soldier's corroboration of such practices:

> Sergeants and NCOs are the toughest with minorities. They can be cruel and even sadistic toward Central Asians. They sincerely believe that Russians are superior to Uzbeks, this creates a lot of tension in the units. They give minorities the bad jobs and the extra guard duty.[53]

Soviet authorities probably believe that these problems of deviancy are manageable and that they do not create a major hindrance to cohesion in Soviet combat units formed primarily of Russians and other Slavs.

The building of cohesive units is also promoted by Soviet Army policies that allow the good things in the soldier's life to be controlled at unit level. Promotions, demotions, leaves, and passes, as well as spot awards, are controlled by the soldier's immediate leaders. Such a practice is especially significant because Soviet soldiers are paid extremely small wages. Two important effects in emphasizing the key nature of unit leaders in the soldier's life result. First, low pay significantly lessens the ability of the soldier to leave the unit and thus remove himself from the influence of his fellow soldiers and leaders (extra money from home is discouraged). Second, through a unique system of spot material awards such as watches and special leaves, leaders are often able to promote desired behavior. Goldhamer describes this system in a discussion of a group of soldiers who had distinguished themselves:

> [They] were awarded individual prizes during a ceremony before their unit. One was awarded a gun, another a camera, a third a nickel samovar and a fourth a harmonica.[54]

Traditional military awards are, of course, also utilized and contribute significantly to the leader's ability to build cohesion.

The Israeli Army

The Israeli Army ensures that the formal organization of the Army reaches every soldier. The existence of pockets or groups of soldiers who are not under the firm control of Israeli Army leadership appears to be extremely rare. To achieve this firm control, the smallest units are structured to ensure the presence of formal leadership and linkage with the higher organization. Much training is done in small groups "not exceeding three men." [55] Once formed, the small group is maintained and functions as a reliable unit pursuing Army objectives. An Israeli soldier from Yif'at describes how the process works:

> They shared the same vehicle all through the war, so they became very close to each other. When ambushed they jumped off the jeep taking up positions behind rocks. Thereupon they were no longer three chatting pals but a commander and two men. "From the moment we were attacked there were only orders and objectives," said he.[56]

After basic training, Israeli soldiers are integrated into units in a manner that ensures that the new recruit has found a "home" in which he can expect to stay for the remainder of his service. The Israeli Army does not regard the Israeli soldier as a "spare part." Once assigned, he is integrated into the unit in a manner that binds him firmly within a cohesive unit and that rotates him in and out of combat as a member of that unit:

> In the Israeli Army it is customary, at the termination of basic training, to mix old and new recruits within the small units . . . the soldier (NCO) with some length of service is able to guide the newcomers in the many arts of soldiering, thereby acquiring respect and authority. He will teach members of the squad what he has learned about the border areas which he now knows well, he will show them how to articulate their grievances, advise them on matters relating to their obligations and so on. He will in full view of his men, be patted on the shoulder by the regimental commander who drops in for inspection.[57]

Life in the small Israeli unit follows a pattern that reaches out and totally claims the new soldier and maintains this cohesiveness

for the duration of his service. First, there is a rite of passage, which lasts until the new recruit learns the norms, attitude, and behavior desired by the unit. Training is demanding, and little time is available for other activities. In this manner, the high frequency of association among unit members needed for cohesion is maintained. Maintenance and off-time in the daily schedule are also structured to ensure maximum contact among unit members. The design of barracks, mess halls, and other facilities promote unit association and make it difficult for the individual soldier to withdraw. Various berets and other distinguishing insignia are worn with pride and reinforce unit boundaries. Opportunities for absences away from the unit are restricted and closely controlled. The Israeli soldier can expect to be away from his unit only 4 days in every 90, thus the opportunities to join or belong to autonomous groups capable of challenging the cohesion of the small unit are significantly reduced.

The good things in the Israeli soldier's life are mediated and dispensed through his immediate unit with the commander playing a prominent role, though the pay and other material benefits of the term soldier are small compared to those of the professional career Israeli soldier. Passes, awards, and other good things must be earned and are not easily gained. For example, within the entire Israeli Defense Force—Army, Navy, and Air Force—less than 120 medals for bravery had been awarded through 1979.[58] Letters of recognition presented by unit commanders are much more common and are prized within the small unit.

TABLE 3

Maintenance of Unit Integrity and Stability

	Army			
Element	*North Vietnamese*	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Smallest unit under 5 soldiers and under positive control of leader	+ +	–	+	+ +
Replacement by unit rotation	+ +	––	+ +	+ +
Strong resocialization process	+ +	–	+ +	+ +

TABLE 3

Maintenance of Unit Integrity and Stability—Continued

Element	Army			
	North Vietnamese	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
High frequency of association through policies, facility design, and social functions	+ +	-	+	+ +
Unit boundaries established through tradition and long time affiliation	+ +	+	+	+
Control of soldier's affiliation with outside groups	+ +	-	+ +	+
Leave and pass policies controlled and limited	+ +	--	+ +	+
Control over rewards—pay, passes, promotions, etc. at unit level	+ +	-	+ +	+

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --

Motivation and Control

The North Vietnamese Army

Without a doubt, one of the strongest and most significant factors of the North Vietnamese Army's endurance and eventual dominance in Vietnam was the normative motivational approach taken by the NVA to bind its soldiers to the organization. Rather than the tangible rewards and "economic man" assumptions relied upon for attracting and retaining soldiers in other armies, the NVA relied almost exclusively on an approach that required the internalization of strong group values and norms that bound the NVA soldier to the organization and its objectives. This type of motivation, which achieves congruency between group norms and organizational objectives, provided the NVA with the strongest possible basis for preparing soldiers to endure the hardships of

war as part of a strong and cohesive unit. The operative principles of the system are illustrated in an NVA organizational directive:

> a. Organization: . . . We must organize the three-man-cell based on the following principles:
>
> we should pick three men who are most closely related to one another in their functions and form them into a cell. . . .
>
> we should insert Party and Group members into every cell to insure its quality. . . .
>
> b. Scope of activities: include discussions on methods to carry out the combat tasks and missions assigned to each platoon, squad, cell, and members; and examination of the physical and mental life of each individual; and his personal feelings and desires. . . .
>
> these discussions can be conducted every day, during off-duty hours in the evening, during the 10-minutes breaks of a training session or at the last halt of a movement near the bivouacking area. We can even conduct them while our units are conducting a combat operation or about to withdraw, as the situation permits, in order to strengthen our troops' morale. The themes of discussion must be short, simple, realistic and in keeping with the situation and mission of the cell. . . .

An NVA soldier described the effect of such policies:

> The troops in a unit considered the political officer as their mother. This cadre always . . . saw to it the unit was unified. Besides the ideological training, the political cadres also promoted the fighting spirit of the soldiers and took charge of their subsistence, i.e., food and drink, etc. Because of this devotion the troops in a unit liked and respected the political officer very much. Due to such respect and confidence, the troops could always overcome the difficulties in the fighting, as well as in the daily work, carry out thoroughly the orders of the cadres and achieve good results for the unit . . .[59]

The United States Army

Over the past decade, the US Army has moved significantly toward utilitarian motivation, described by Charles Moskos as the occupational end of his institutional-occupational model.[60] Policy decisions necessary to support the All-Volunteer Army are designed to appeal much more to the personal self-interest of soldiers, rather than to the "higher good" of service to the nation. The movement toward viewing soldiering as just another job,

subject to marketplace demands, makes the building of cohesive units extremely difficult. In describing the assumptions that underlie the All-Volunteer Army, Moskos documents this shift in perspective:

> The marketplace premise of the Gates Commission and the architects of the present AVF [All-Volunteer Force] dovetailed with the systems analysts who had become ascendant in the Department of Defense under both Democratic and Republican administrations. Whether under the rubric of econometrics or systems analysis, *the redefinition of military service is based on a core set of assumptions. First*, there is no analytical distinction between military systems and other systems, especially no difference between cost-effectiveness analysis of civilian enterprises and military services. *Second*, military compensation should as much as possible be in cash (rather than in kind or deferred) and be linked as much as possible to skill differences of individual service members (thereby allowing for a more efficient operation of the marketplace). *Third*, social cohesion and goal commitment are essentially unmeasurable (thereby an inappropriate object of analysis). *Fourth*, if end-strength manpower targets are met in the AVF, social organizational factors are incidental concerns [emphasis added].[61]

Current US Army "managers," with some encouraging exceptions, do not recognize that normative motivation is the only force on the battlefield strong enough to cause soldiers to advance reliably against enemy fire. Instead, such managers choose to assume that the soldier is an "economic man" motivated primarily by personal gain. It is not recognized that individual decisions made for tangible gain allow the soldier to "opt out" of an organization if the going gets too tough. In an army where the primary incentives are economic, the soldier is not strongly bound to his unit—no job is worth getting killed for. Elsewhere I have shown that reliance on economic motivation is increasing:

> Marketplace motivation is evident throughout the Army. At the top levels commanders often "negotiate" with subordinate commanders, with results expressed in terms of "contracts." Appeals to join the Army and to reenlist are based on tangible inducements. Re-up bonuses, expensive pay raises and now perhaps targeted pay raises all perpetuate the system.

> Even within the NCO corps tangible incentives are now necessary to entice NCOs into combat-arms leadership jobs and to take the job of First Sergeant—once thought to be the pinnacle of an NCO career. It is evident we are turning increasingly to utilitarian motivation which cannot fail to have long-term deleterious effects on cohesion in the Army.[62]

In spite of the Army's plan to rotate units rather than individuals, the devotion to econometric analysis appears to be as firmly rooted as ever throughout the hierarchy in the Department of Defense. Charles Moskos notes:

> It would be hard to overstate the econometric prevalence among manpower policymakers in the Department of Defense. . . . It appears that as the technical competence of the Department of Defense to deal with personnel data expands, its ability to comprehend armed forces and society declines. We do not want to be so bedeviled with rival sets of numbers, so overwhelmed with data, that the key theoretical questions are hardly understood, much less addressed. What passes for sophisticated econometric analyses actually cloaks an excessive reliance on simplistic market incentives.[63]

The view of the All-Volunteer Army reflected above is not focused only in academia or among a small number of observers with a peculiar view of recent developments. The view that the volunteer Army has reduced the Army's control and made the building of cohesive units extremely difficult is widespread. In a Congressional Research report, Goldrich observes:

> There is little doubt that the extent to which the military as an institution exerts control over its members . . . has diminished substantially over the past two decades. Formerly, this extraordinary control was considered to be a mainstay of military discipline. . . . Certain aspects of the AVF appear to have contributed directly to this erosion of control. The dramatic rise in junior enlisted pay, for instance, has given single enlisted personnel much more discretion. . . . Cars and frequent off-base excursions are two of the most significant examples. The same rise in pay . . . has led to a considerable number of single enlisted personnel living off-base, and therefore, little different from civilian commuters going to and from work each day. The greatly increased proportion of married junior enlisted personnel has similarly diminished the control of the Armed Forces over more of its members. . . . Finally, the steep rise in first-term enlisted attrition

> unquestionably results from a tacit policy decision by DOD that it is more appropriate to discharge a recalcitrant than use traditional military discipline to motivate him. . . . Put in another way, the All-Volunteer military, like industrial organizations, is witnessing the common occurrence of its members "quitting or being fired." [64]

Finally, unrecognized by most who serve, the US military justice system has gradually seen a significant change in its basic purposes. Again Goldrich makes the point:

> The extent to which military justice and discipline have been closely aligned with civilian justice, in terms of procedural safeguards, narrowing of military jurisdiction, and contract law, began in the 1960s, well before the AVF began in 1973. It would seem logical to assume, however, that other aspects of the AVF would reinforce the trend of removing the previous primary goal of military justice—the maintenance of military discipline—and replacing it with the general civilian judicial objective of safeguarding the rights of the accused.[65]

The Soviet Army

A textbook for higher military-political schools of the Soviet Army and Navy, *Military Psychology*, presents Soviet thought on how men are best motivated in modern warfare. In a turgid but definite manner the text's authors forward the Soviet view that the only force on the battlefield strong enough to cause men to fight for Soviet goals is a motivation and control system based on internalized values within the group (Kollective).

> The psychology of a collective [small unit] is controlled in day-to-day activity. Its significance rises under difficult and dangerous conditions. Control of the mental states of primary collectives [primary groups] . . . is a condition for guaranteeing the actual conduct of people [soldiers].[66]

Representative of the same doctrine, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolovsky and others note

> modern combat has an exceptionally fierce character and will have a strong effect upon the emotions and feelings of a soldier. In turn, moral-political feeling [group norms] more and more are becoming the most important motives in the behavior of a soldier in combat.[67]

Nowhere in Soviet writing or doctrine is it suggested that utilitarian motivation or the motivation of the marketplace is

desirable or adequate for motivating soldiers in combat. The emphasis within Soviet units is for the leadership to work in a personal and direct way with regular soldiers in order to bond them together in a Kollective that will pursue Soviet Army objectives. Official Soviet Army policy underscores the desirability of personal and continuing face-to-face contact between leaders and soldiers:

> Information on the state of collective [unit] opinion as a condition for controlling it: Only great closeness to the people [soldiers] and an excellent knowledge of each man makes it possible to effectively disclose the reasons for a multiplicity of collective opinions. . . . The prevention of individual negative opinions from developing into group ones is particularly important and essential before carrying out responsible tasks and in various difficult situations.[68]

The role of Soviet officers and sergeants is prescribed in order to build the mutual trust necessary among leaders and soldiers. Desired officer traits are officially described in the same publication as characterized by "moral consciousness, sincerity, sensitivity and attentiveness, benevolence, accessibility." Soviet Army NCOs, however, appear to have the major role in maintaining daily, face-to-face contact on behalf of the organization. They are also cautioned not to become too representative of soldiers' opinions at the expense of Soviet Army goals:

> According to the conditions of military service and everyday life, sergeants sleep, eat, and study along with their subordinates. They are also more susceptible to the influence of the soldier's opinion.[69]

It appears that Kollectives develop extremely strong bonds and norms that are generally congruent with Soviet Army goals. Deviancy, however, does occur, and there is evidence Soviet authorities are concerned.[70] Beyond the extensive ethnic problems described earlier, which are a major source of deviancy, the Soviets acknowledge that intense pressures on soldiers accompanied by "boredom" are principal causes for "absences without leave, hooliganism, and drunkenness." The life of the Soviet soldier is not enviable. His strenuous seven-day-a-week routine starts at 6:00 a.m. and ends at 10:00 p.m. He is paid approximately six rubles a month (about $4) and sometimes gets 10 days of leave in 2 years. He is not allowed civilian clothes during his two-

year enlistment and must be marched everywhere when in a group of three or more, even during time off. The overall environment of the Soviet soldier is harsh:

> One of the chief characteristics of the Soviet forces is the enormous pressure brought to bear on all ranks, but especially on the new recruits and the young officers. The continuous pressure of a rigorous training process, the severity of discipline, incessant political indoctrination, the pressure for and to acquire higher specialist ratings, the lack of genuine recreational facilities, and the all-persuasive influence of socialist competition [quotas] clearly have a depressing effect on troop morale.[71]

Though the effects of these sources of deviancy that hinder military cohesion and effectiveness are unclear, knowledgeable observers indicate that "when the chips are down" the effects will be significantly lessened.[72] Goldhamer supports such a view:

> A knowledge of the sources of malaise in the Soviet military forces does not permit confident interpretations of the depth or distribution of that malaise. . . . If, as we suppose, despite some loss of efficiency, the Soviet forces in peacetime are not seriously affected by morale problems in the performance of their missions, then we clearly have even less reason to assume that peacetime "gripes" will be of decisive significance in time of war.[73]

As imperfect as Soviet control over the individual Soviet soldier might appear at times, there is little doubt that the unit or Kollective to which most soldiers belong is the primary group in the soldier's life. As such, it is the prime determinant of his daily behavior which, by and large, is congruent with Soviet Army expectations and objectives.

The Israeli Army

The motivation of the Israeli soldier is the strongest possible—his loyalty to his unit and his strong links to his community and nation make him willing to conform to the expectations of his fellow soldiers even when he is alone on the battlefield. His willingness to advance under fire, his conviction that it is the right thing to do, is rooted in the internalization of extremely strong unit norms that make that unit and its expectations about his actions the primary determinant of his behavior. In the Six-Day War, the group held extraordinary influence:

> Soldiers had a habit after an engagement, of shuffling through the dunes toward the road to see who was being evacuated, pressing the drivers of the vehicles to disclose who the casualties were. They seemed to know every casualty by name, and often climbed into the truck to offer solace to their friends. They often had to be driven away to allow the vehicle to proceed to the first-aid center in the rear.[74]

The Israeli Army recognizes that unit cohesion has been a major factor in its victories over the Arab armies:

> The decisive role of social ties and comradeship in the Six-Day War has been sufficiently established by conversations with returning soldiers. On numerous occasions soldiers were asked what sustained them in moments of dire peril, and what had driven them on. Only an insignificant minority gave hatred for the Arab as a motivating factor. Most of the interviewed stressed the need to fulfill their obligation toward their fellow soldiers—"the affiliative motive" as it has been called. In interviews with wounded soldiers in hospitals heard on the Israeli radio, the word *ha-herrah* (my buddies) is mentioned with monotonous frequency.[75]

The Arabs, however, provided an obvious contrast to this tremendously powerful Israeli cohesion. Major General Harkabi, former Chief of Israeli Intelligence and a well-known Arabist scholar, observed:

> The Arab soldier, instead of becoming a part of a team and deriving confidence from it, turns into a lonely and isolated individual. Since social ties are weak, the formal framework holding the unit breaks down under the pressure of battle. Officers conceal food and water, demonstrate little concern for their unit, and show complete disinterest in their men. . . . It is not that the Arab fighting man was not trained or indoctrinated sufficiently; but these precepts were cold and lifeless statutes from which he drew no inspiration. Egyptian company commanders did not know the names of the men in their units, often treating them as rabble, and they in turn showed little love toward their superiors.[76]

The Israeli Army ensures that the strength of the cohesive unit is employed for Army purposes through face-to-face leadership, especially at the small-unit level, where each soldier is personally aware of his leader and the example he is setting. In both the Sinai Campaign and the Six-Day War, almost half of the total number of Israelis killed were officers.[77] The attitude of the

Israeli soldier toward his leader is to "believe in him, rely on him, and expect him to give them the right orders. Therefore his job is not to send the orders but to go with them." [78]

TABLE 4

Unit Motivation and Control

Element	*Army*			
	North Vietnamese	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Members bonded to unit through norms and values	+ +	--	+	+ +
Personal approach to small-unit leadership, not managerial	+ +	-	-	+ +
Leader-soldier interaction on basis of trust, not contracts	+ +	-	+	+ +
Normative "service" motivation, not "economic man" utilitarian motivation	+ +	-	+	+ +

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --

Surveillance and Conformity

The North Vietnamese Army

For those brief periods when cohesion was weakened by unmitigated hardship and danger accompanied by the absence of strong leadership, the NVA system of surveillance and reporting became extremely important. This system allowed the NVA to maintain unit integrity until normative motivation could be reestablished within the weakened unit. In addition, the NVA system of surveillance and reporting on the attitudes and behavior of each individual soldier allowed NVA leadership to take action as necessary to reinforce cohesion within the unit. Powerful criticism and self-criticism techniques for focusing group pressures and

utilizing individual soldier needs for social contact were controlled within the NVA to maintain congruency between group and NVA organizational norms. A significant characteristic of the NVA surveillance and reporting system was that it was perceived as completely legitimate by the great majority of NVA soldiers. NVA soldiers operated the system personally. They initiated reports on deviant soldiers and participated in focusing group pressures against the deviant soldier. The effectiveness of the system for assisting the NVA in maintaining cohesion is evident in the following answers from an NVA soldier:

Question: Do you think that the criticism and self-criticism is good or bad? Do you think it is fair?

Answer: I believe that criticism and self-criticism is very good and fair. It is also very necessary for the strength of the unit; it helps to bring about progress within the unit. Criticism is made in order to improve a person, in order to permit the unit to constantly build itself up in a constructive way. . . . Criticism and self-criticism are complementary: I make a self-criticism, but there are still one or two of my weak points that I refuse to bring out for review, perhaps out of pride. But my comrades will extract them from me, because I can never conceal them completely, however I try. . . .

Question: What did the other men say about the method of criticism and self-criticism? Were there any men in the unit who didn't approve of it or were against it?

Answer: Generally speaking, everyone approved of criticism and self-criticism. This was because we all recognized that if there was no criticism, the problem—whatever it might be—would be left unsolved among the disputants, and as such, it could only cause annoyance and trouble to the unit as a whole. Like a small spot of staining oil, you must wipe and clean it out as soon as you spot it, for if you allow it to spread out, then very soon it

> will cause great damage. . . . Thus, in many cases, the men in the unit suggested that a criticism session be held if such a session had not yet been called. Apart from the unscheduled criticism sessions, there were regular ones held every month and week: the purpose of those sessions was to permit the men to express their viewpoint because it was believed that everyone's opinion could be useful and beneficial to the unit as a whole. It was expected that each man would stand up and make his own self-criticism. I believe that everyone in the unit was convinced of the good of those sessions. No one ever expressed disapproval on this point. Of course those who had lots of vices and had committed many faults would naturally feel reluctant to stand up and make a self-criticism, but no one ever denied the usefulness of such a method as a means of self-improvement.[79]

The United States Army

Observation, reporting, and focusing of peer pressure on deviant soldiers by fellow soldiers does not routinely occur in the US Army except in some elite units where a high degree of congruency exists between group norms and Army objectives. Deviance or breaking unit rules and regulations is not viewed by most soldiers as a violation of group trust about how American soldiers expect fellow soldiers to behave. Instead, Army rules, regulations, and missions tend to be viewed as part of, and emanating from, management. When left up to the individual soldier, such rules are not included in the day-to-day factors that govern his behavior. Instead, the soldier tends to view his relationship with the Army as part of the traditional employee-employer relationship, with the soldier having little if any personal responsibility for self-enforcement of organizational rules. The soldier who does act to enforce Army norms is seen as an "informer" who "snitches" on fellow soldiers and is quickly put out of the group or worse.

Rather than forming small units with high degrees of cohesion centered around personal commitments to Army norms and

objectives, US soldiers appear increasingly to have a civilianized and limited attitude about the extent to which they are part of the Army and are personally committed to Army objectives. A Congressional Research Service report notes:

> The average first-term enlistee in the All-Volunteer Force is not yet socialized into the military environment. He therefore will tend to evaluate job choices according to civilian criteria. . . . These include job satisfaction—in terms of the individual tasks to be performed and the working environment—and compensation and benefits. . . . If the exigencies of military service demand that any of these conditions be changed, then the recruit feels shortchanged or cheated. This may be contrasted with the draft era, during which a recruit expected few if any individual preferences to be granted. . . . A by-product of [this development] is the growing applicability of contract law to enlistment contracts and compensation, training and service guarantees.[80]

The Soviet Army

The Soviets have instituted a comprehensive and sophisticated surveillance and reporting system for ensuring conformity within military Kollectives. Shelyag, Glotochkin, and Platonov make clear the significance that the Soviets believe surveillance and reporting, including criticism, can have in forming and maintaining day-to-day behavior rules for the Kollective as well as in correcting poor ideological attitudes:

> Collective opinion has a particular influence on the soldier's personality . . . deeds and conduct. In directing and correcting the deeds and conduct of people in accord with requirements of the surrounding social milieu, it maximally contributes to forming in them qualities necessary for service and combat. Collective opinion, thus, operates as a regulator of the deeds and conduct of men.[81]

Ideally in the Soviet system, collective norms are to be enforced by all members of the unit. Regulations require all enlisted soldiers as well as officers and NCOs to "restrain others from misdeeds" and to report them if observed. Results are mixed, however, with the greatest burden for operating the system falling on the officers and NCOs with help from informers employed by the KGB and other police activities.[82]

Criticism and self-criticism are effectively employed to focus opinion against rulebreakers. When the rulebreaker is a sergeant, an officer, or a Party member, lower-ranking soldiers sometimes are prompted to report their observations, a form of criticism that does support the system.[83] While the lower-ranking soldiers do not enthusiastically support the system, its overall effectiveness is such that the Soviet chain of command appears to be reasonably well informed of events within units and able to focus enough collective attention to ensure conformity. In addition, as Goldhamer observes, isolation of soldiers from most outside contacts, even when on pass, significantly aids control:

> Surveillance is an essential component of the Soviet control system. . . . When soldiers go on an excursion or to the theater and number more than three, they must move to their destination in formation under the command of the senior man in the group. Similarly Soviet officers are encouraged to take their vacations in groups.[84]

The Israeli Army

There appears to be a comprehensive observation and reporting system within the Israeli Army. It views deviance as a violation of group trust concerning peer expectations about individual attitudes and behavior. The system is operated by Israeli soldiers on an entirely informal basis with no formal reporting or follow-up criticism or self-criticism sessions designed to focus group pressure on deviant soldiers. No guidance is issued nor does the formal organization appear to promote observation or reporting in any manner. But 95 percent of the soldiers queried in one survey concerning their identification with Army values stated that "they felt keenly the misbehavior of other soldiers." [85] Regarding the informal nature of the observation and reporting:

> No less significant in discussion with returned soldiers was the social stigma factor. Men said what worried them most during combat was what others would think of them, or what their friends and families would feel about them when they came home.[86]

Of course, the ultimate benefit to an army occurs when soldiers behave and act in accordance with group expectations, even when they are not being observed by their fellow soldiers. An explanation of his actions in the 1967 war by an Israeli tank

commander demonstrates the power of the group even when it is not present. The tanker "explained that instead of trying to locate his lost platoon . . . he chose to charge at a dozen Egyptian tanks, this being a more practical undertaking." [87]

When similar attitudes are evident throughout an army, effective combat behavior, evidenced by Israeli Army action in the 1967 war, becomes characteristic:

> Once action begins nothing is allowed to stop the advance. The troops force their vehicles onward, patching them up as best they can. . . . Supplies other than fuel and water are rarely waited for. . . . In most cases they achieve superiority by sheer stamina, by superior physical exertion and by an almost unlimited ability to rough it for days on end. . . . some went without sleep for three days and nights, and after both they and the enemy were all but exhausted they mounted a new offensive. . . . They overpowered their enemies by their ability to take greater punishment, suffer greater hardships and strain out the last ounce of physical exertion.[88]

TABLE 5

Surveillance and Conformity

	Army			
Element	*North Vietnamese*	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Reports on soldier deviancy initiated by peers	+ +	--	-	+
Deviance viewed as violation of group trust/expectations	+ +	--	-	+ +
Reporting not viewed as "informing," deviant soldier returns to group	+ +	--	+	+
Leaders successfully focus group pressures against deviant soldier	+ +	-	+	+

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --

Commonality of Values

The cultural values underlying cohesion are discussed more completely in chapters 5 and 6. This chapter identifies the degree to which these values were evident within the units of the four armies being examined and the degree to which they affected cohesion.

The North Vietnamese Army

Units within the NVA were very homogeneous ethnically. Separate NVA units were formed for Montagnard and other ethnic groups.[89] As a result, the commonality of values and the ease of communications necessary for building cohesive units were promoted. Additionally, although the NVA had women soldiers, they were segregated by sex and function and generally performed support missions.

The United States Army

Significant ethnic and minority diversity exists within the US Army, sometimes making difficult the communication based on shared values that is necessary for cohesion.

Since 1949 the percentage of black soldiers in the Army has increased from 5.9 percent to over 30 percent.[90] In some units, primarily the combat arms, the percentage is significantly higher. The number of Hispanic and other minorities is also increasing. At the same time, the background of white recruits is not representative of American society; except for the last year or so whites have been coming from the least educated portions of US society. None of these major groups can be said to be representative of middle American social norms or of any other set of common norms, based on shared cultural values, that could be used as a basis for promoting cohesion. Moskos sees the problem:

> The Army has been attracting not only a disproportionate number of minorities, but also an unrepresentative segment of white youth, who are more uncharacteristic of the broader social mix than are minority soldiers.[91]

It appears that the resocialization of minorities upon initial entry into the Army is not sufficient to prevent the reemergence of voluntary resegregation among soldiers when they are on their

own time. Race has been determined to be a major factor or a "true determinant of social affiliation" among the soldiers of the volunteer Army.[92] Because of the plentiful free time, high pay, and lessened control described earlier, race and other diverse cultural characteristics have become the bases for the formation of independent groups beyond the boundaries and control of the US Army. To the degree that deviant norms (coming from such sources as the use of drugs or racism) exist within these groups, the greater the difficulty small-unit leaders will have in building cohesive units.

While women are no longer segregated by sex in the US Army, there is growing evidence of the advantage of limiting their further assignment to traditional tasks.[93] To the extent that women and men are assigned by traditional functions, cohesion will be promoted. Combat effectiveness and its enhancement through the promotion of policies that further cohesion must be the overriding consideration.

Organized women's groups and elected politicians must be educated as to what goes on in combat areas; they must be made to realize that women in such environments generally cannot contribute as much to winning the battle as can male soldiers. Women in such situations seriously impede the development of unit cohesion. This, combined with generally lesser physical capabilities and field endurance and, in many cases, with socialized role inhibitions that significantly hinder their duty performance in the hardship and danger of combat areas, causes women to become less capable than men in combat roles. For these reasons, the Israelis, the North Vietnamese, and the Soviets sharply limit the types of duty women perform in their armed forces. American decisionmakers must resist internal domestic pressures that have nothing to do with preparing for combat to expand the role of women into jobs in combat areas that men can better perform.[94] Such resistance becomes especially critical during an election year, when domestic political factors tend to outweigh other valid considerations.

The Soviet Army

As discussed previously, the Soviet Army is experiencing significant ethnic conflict. As far as is evident, Army units are not

ethnically pure and are not formed on a national basis. This is the result of a conscious policy decision by the Soviets to use the Army as an "instrument of national integration." [95] Significant successes have been achieved, however, in spreading the knowledge of Russian among the non-Russian minorities in the Soviet Union.[96] The cost of such integration has been significant ethnic conflict, especially in those units that are comprised of the most diverse ethnic elements. Soviet policy, however, appears to be successful in limiting the effects of ethnic conflict on combat effectiveness. This is done by simply not assigning non-Slavs to elite combat units and by assigning only very small contingents to support labor positions in other combat units. As a result, much of the evident conflict and accompanying "hooliganism" recently highlighted in the Western press appears to be in construction units and in other low-priority units that have been assigned the great burden of acting as "instruments of national integration."

Hence, ethnic conflict does not appear to significantly impair combat effectiveness where it counts—in the Soviet combat arms. In these units, evidence suggests that soldiers and leaders are able to communicate effectively, to share, and largely to adhere to key Kollective norms; they generally do not form autonomous minority groups with norms incongruent with Soviet Army objectives. The reverse of the above is generally true, however, of many Soviet units of lower priority.

In sharp contrast to World War II, when 800,000 Soviet women played a major role in the Soviet armed forces, today the role of women is sharply limited. By estimate, only 10,000 women serve on active duty, generally in traditional roles such as communications, medicine, and teaching. Because they are assigned to support functions, it would appear that they have little impact on cohesion in combat units.[97] If Soviet manpower pools fall sharply as is expected in the 1980s, however, one solution would be to call more women to serve.[98]

The Israeli Army

The ethnic composition of the Israeli Army is extremely diverse: many different languages and accents are heard within its ranks. With the exception of the Druze Arabs, Israeli units are

completely integrated. (Druze units are ethnically pure at the request of Druze leaders.) Apparently, the Israelis have made a conscious decision to use the Army as an instrument of national integration. Whatever the reasons, their efforts have been remarkably successful. For all of its ethnic diversity and some tension between the European culture of the Ashkenazi Jews and the Moslem culture of the Sephardim Jews, there appears to be an overall attitude that the Army of Israel is "one big family."

After a very short time in the Army, the Israeli soldier is able to communicate effectively in the national language with many ethnic types. Because of the leveling socialization experienced within the Army, the Israeli soldier soon shares and adheres to a dominant set of norms that are not peculiarly ethnic but that represent national values more than anything else. In the words of one observer, the Israeli soldier's "prolonged stay in the Army shapes his future citizenship more than any other factor." [99]

While women in the Israeli Army receive a great amount of publicity, their present duties remain of the traditional type. They teach, perform secretarial and medical duties, operate telephone systems, and serve as mechanics.[100] They live in segregated barracks that are well guarded. Though all women are equally eligible under the law to be drafted, in practice, liberal exemptions are granted so that only about 50 percent serve.[101] Although they are regarded as significant in meeting Israeli manpower requirements, their role in the Israeli Army appears to be one of traditional, functional support and is organized in such a manner that it does not adversely affect unit cohesion within all-male combat units.

TABLE 6

Commonality of Values

	Army			
Element	*North Vietnamese*	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Units ethnically similar and share major cultural values	+ +	+	-	+

TABLE 6

Commonality of Values—Continued

Element	Army			
	North Vietnamese	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Integrated units resocialized to allow common values and behavior	+ +	+	-	+ +
Units organized by sex or sex and function	+ +	-	+ +	+ +

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --

The following table summarizes the major comparative categories covered in chapter 4.

TABLE 7

Summary Comparison of Major Factors Promoting Small-Unit Cohesion

Element	Army			
	North Vietnamese	*United States*	*Soviet*	*Israeli*
Physical, social, and security needs	+ +	-	+	+ +
Negative escape routes from army	+ +	--	+ +	+ +
Unit integrity and stability	+ +	--	+ +	+ +
Motivation and control	+ +	+	+	+ +
Surveillance and conformity	+ +	--	+	+ +
Commonality of values	+ +	+	-	+ +

Legend: Strong + +
+
-
Weak --